DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 367 019 CS 508 476

AUTHOR Hunt, Steve; Inch, Ed
TITLE Evaluating or Assessing the College or University Debate Program.
PUB DATE Nov 93
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (79th, Miami Beach, FL, November 18-21, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Debate; Educational Assessment; *Evaluation Methods; Evaluation Problems; Higher Education; Outcomes of Education; *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Authentic Assessment; Program Objectives

ABSTRACT

While no one instrument can accurately evaluate or assess every college or university debate program, two separate frameworks can be established based in forensics and assessment literature. The first framework is a descriptive/analytic/evaluative framework for a debate program based on the philosophies of the several national conferences on forensics and debate, the literature on directing forensics, and on debate program surveys. The second framework is a more empirical/qualitative one based on recent trends in assessing the outcomes of college education and is still in the process of being formulated. Prospectively, the framework can be applied to many debate program goals but currently it has one "half-way-worked-out" exemplar, that being the template for evaluating a debate program vis-a-vis its development of critical thinking. Forensics educators are going to have to operationalize the goals of debate and find or create empirical tests to measure how well they teach students. (Thirty-four footnotes are included.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Evaluating or Assessing the College or University Debate Program

Steve Hunt, Lewis & Clark College
Ed Inch Pacific Lutheran University
Prepared for SCA Convention Miami, November, 1993

ED 367 019

Introduction

It is impossible to create a single instrument that would accurately evaluate or assess every college or university debate program. The programs are too diverse. Some programs are at large public universities while others are at small private liberal arts colleges and still others at junior colleges. Some debate programs emphasize NDT debate, while others do CEDA, still others do ADA or Parliamentary debate or varying combinations of several types of debate. Evaluation and assessment can only work if it is tailored to the individual program. The program must be evaluated or assessed within its environmental context and according to its own goals and emphases. Then too debate is too complex an educational activity to be assessed by a single instrument. The goals of debate encompass skills, behaviors, knowledges, and attitudes at the heart of a liberal arts education. No single instrument can possibly simultaneously measure changes in critical thinking abilities, listening abilities, communication skills, research skills, knowledge concerning the place of argumentation and debate in a free democratic society, and the many other skills, behaviors, knowledges, and attitudes affected by debate.

CS508476

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Hunt

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Two separate frameworks for evaluating or assessing debate programs can, however, be established based on forensics and assessment literature. The first framework is a descriptive/analytic/evaluative framework for a debate program based on the philosophies of the several national conferences on forensics and debate, the literature on directing forensics, and on debate program surveys. The second framework is a more empirical/quantitative one prospectively based on recent trends in assessing the outcomes of college education. It is an empirical assessments outcome framework still in the process of being formulated. Prospectively this framework can be applied to many debate program goals but currently it has but one really half way worked out exemplar, that being the template for evaluating a debate program vis a vis its development of critical thinking. The authors will discuss both frameworks with the idea in mind that various aspects of either or both could be incorporated into a tailor made evaluative system for a particular debate program.

Framework #1: Descriptive/Evaluative/Analytic Standards for a College or University Debate Program

Basic information describing the educational philosophy or mission of a college or university debate program can be gleaned from the main texts on directing forensics.[1] These can then be supplemented and reinforced by the several national conferences assessing forensics.[2] A baseline comparative basis for a program in terms of staffing, curriculum, participation, budget, et al can then be derived from the several recent surveys of forensics programs. [3]

This is the traditional way in which debate programs have evaluated themselves. It has a few quantitative aspects and anecdotal information about student outcomes but is more descriptive/evaluative/analytic than quantitative in nature.

A. Forensics Philosophy

The Sedalia Conference on forensics stated that " forensics is an educational activity primarily concerned with using an argumentative perspective in examining problems and communicating with people."[4] An argumentative or debate perspective was at the heart of forensics for these conferees. They anticipated that a forensics program would have both debate and individual events embedded in both the curriculum of a communications department and as a cocurricular competitive activity. They felt that an education in forensics should enable students:

> To understand and communicate various forms of argument effectively in a variety of contexts and with a variety of audiences.
> To learn theories that seek to explain the process of communicating arguments with people.
> To analyze controversies, select and evaluate evidence, construct and refute arguments, and understand and use the values of the audience as warrants for beliefs.
> To participate effectively as advocates or critics in situations where decisions must be made.
> To clarify one's personal and social values through confrontation with the value judgments advanced by others.
> To promote respect for the integrity of evidence, accurate representation of the ideas of others, rigorous examination of beliefs, and the procedures by which critical decisions are reached.[5]

Faules, Rieke, and Rhodes are quite insistent that directors of forensics have a clearly thought out philosophy and rationale for forensics activities[6]. They believe in a diversity of types of forensics programs but think that all programs ought to improve public speaking and student understanding of decision making. They state that the primary goal of forensics "is the teaching of content variables in communication and decision-making, for which intercollegiate and interscholastic debate remain the primary vehicles."[7]

These perspectives are buttressed, reinforced, and explained by the rationale statement adopted by the Second National Conference on Forensics:

> Cultivating the argumentative perspective involves developing and improving students' abilities in research, analysis, and effective advocacy. These skills are fostered through curricular academic instruction and participation in co-curricular activities such as debate, public address, and interpretation of literature. These activities serve as educational laboratories in which students experiment with skills and develop their own abilities and styles of argument. Typicaliy, forensics activities are competitive, so that students may be motivated to strive for the highest quality of work of which they are capable.
>
> Forensics trains students in research, analysis, and critical thinking skills through discovery of lines of argument and their probative value. Students learn to identify facts, derive the underlying values, and then to utilize this information in formulating reasoned decisions. Forensics also improves proficiency in oral communication. Participants learn tents of organization, principles of persuasion, and effective delivery skills....
>
> Forensics activities are interdisciplinary, integrating learning from a wide variety of academic fields. Topics and subject matter are taken from such disciplines as economics, politics, literature, sociology, science, and communication. As students

> develop proficiency in critical thinking, writing, and speaking the major goals of a liberal education are advanced. Students of diverse academic interests may derive significant benefits from forensics education....
> Forensics students occupy important positions in the life of the nation. The activity offers dependable foundation for careers in such areas as law, communication, public affairs, education, business, and politics. In addition, participants acquire knowledge and skills which are crucial to effective participation in a democratic society....
> Debate is distinctive because of its dialectical form, providing the opportunity for intellectual clash in the testing of ideas. The creation of an argument is one of the most complex cognitive acts, since it involves research, organizing and analyzing data, recognizing and critiquing different methods of reasoning, synthesizing ideas, understanding the logic of decision making, and communicating complex ideas clearly.[8]

The first check one can make then in evaluating or assessing a debate program is to check on the forensics philosophy or stated rationale for the program. This forensics philosophy ought to appear in some kind of program statement, in forensics brochures, and in department plans associated with the debate program. If no educational rationale currently exists for a program or if the rationale is a bit threadbare, a rationale or philosophy can be created with a bit of reading in directing forensics texts and by going to the formulations of the various national forensics conferences.

B. Debate Program Staffing

Nothing is so important to the direction of a debate program, to its educational mission, and to its ongoing stability as a good debate staff led by a capable director of forensics. Hunt has emphasized this before in his article "Avoiding the Burn Out of CEDA Educators".[9] This same point is made, albeit in differing fashions, by E. Sam Cox in

"Assessing and Re-Positioning the Educational Function of Collegiate Debate"[10] and by C.T. Hanson in "What are the Expectations for the Forensic Educator."[11]

The Sedalia Conference laid out guidelines for the preparation of forensics educators or directors of forensics. For two-year forensics educators they recommended:

> A. Recommended minimum qualifications
> 1. Master's degree with a major in speech communication for at least one of the two degrees.
> 2. Specific formal instruction in argumentation.
> 3. Participation at the college level in the forensics activities that the teacher will direct.
> 4. A course in philosophy and methods of directing forensics.[12]

For four year college and university forensics educators, they recommended:

> A. Recommended minimum qualifications
> 1. Master's degree with a major in speech communication for at least one of the two degrees.
> 2. Specific formal instruction in argumentation.
> 3. Participation at the college level in the forensics activities that the teacher will direct.
> 4. A course in philosophy and methods of directing forensics.
> B. Recommended qualifications
> 1. Doctorate in speech communication.
> 2. Supervised involvement in directing forensics programs.[13]

The Sedalia conferees anticipated that directors of forensics would have experience in collegiate debate if they were to direct collegiate debate. They also thought it was important that forensics educators have a rather extensive background in rhetoric and public address in terms of coursework in argumentation, debate,

persuasion, rhetorical criticism, and forensics. Coursework was to be supplemented by workshop learning and mentoring from an active director of forensics. These qualifications still hold true for most forensic educators today though there is some advocacy that background in argumentation whether it comes from law or extensive study in the philosophy of informal logic is just as important as or perhaps supplements speech communication background. [14]

Besides a well trained director of forensics most successful CEDA or NDT debate programs also have 1 or more other professionals or graduate or law assistants.[15] This "staff" is given release time for their responsibilities in debate. The director of forensics usually gets 1/3 to 1/2 course release time for her/his direction and the assistants get nearly the same though their efforts may be more voluntary in some programs. [16] Some programs have only a single director of forensics or of debate who does it all, but most programs of any size have at least two people. The general ratio seems to be one debate coach to each 4-5 teams.

It is important that the debate duties of the director of forensics and his/her assistants be clearly laid out in a contract or letter of appointment. The director of forensics and debate assistants are like other faculty and other graduate assistants but with additional special responsibilities. These responsibilities and the commensurate release should be clearly specified both for the protection of the individuals involved and for clarity for their sponsoring institutions.

A second evaluative or assessment check on a debate program is to check the forensics staff. Is there a well trained director of debate? Does she or he have the right credentials and training? Is there assistance if the squad is of any size; more than 4-5 teams or additional commitments to individual events. Are staff members given release time for their extensive duties with debate, helping guide research, holding case conferences, listening to practice rounds, and going to tournaments as chauffeur, mentor, facilitator, guide, and debate judge. Are the staff contracts or letters of appointment clear as to debate duties and commensurate release and as to how debate will count in tenure and promotion decisions or in rehiring for those on term contracts? All this is most important to the continued successful functioning of the debate squad.

C. The Debate Curriculum

A third check on the debate program is to check its place in the college or university curriculum. A good debate program has close curricular ties. It is curricular, cocurricular, and extracurricular clearly and simultaneously. A good debate program must have a curricular option for students to learn debate. This means there must be classes in argumentation and debate, at least an introductory argumentation and debate class and preferably some upper division courses in argumentation theory. There also needs to be a way for students to earn academic credit for their cocurricular participation in debate. Some critics have said that good debaters do the research, writing, and argumentation in an academic year equivalent to a master's thesis. If so, they certainly deserve cocurricular or extracurricular credit for at least some of their work. A survey of

most departments of communication with superior debate programs shows credit being given in some form or other for student participation.[17] There also should be a class in directing forensics somewhere in the curriculum for the training of future forensics educators at least at those schools granting M.A.'s or Ph.D.s in communication studies. Unfortunately, the number of such classes seems to be diminishing, but having such a class in the curriculum is a very good sign.[18]

D. Debate Budget

The fiscal support a debate program receives from its college or university also makes a difference. Hunt and Inch's survey of top fifty programs, while not confined to debate only, showed that a top fifty program, on average, needed a budget of $34, 893.[19] Rogers survey, focusing on top CEDA debate programs, showed that a top ninety program needed $27, 243 while a top twenty program averaged $41, 346.[20] Money alone can't buy success as every author in every survey article points out. However, significant fiscal resources are correlated with success. Those programs with the biggest budgets also tend to be those with more forensics staff assistance.[21]

In many instances, these are also the programs that have financial aid or forensics scholarships available for debaters. Rogers found significant financial support available to debaters at least on top 20 squads.[22] Hunt and Inch found less support but again in a more generic survey that included squads with individual events participants too.[23] The Stepp and Thompson survey did not ask about financial aid.[24] Murphy's survey would tend to confirm that

big rich programs with large budgets and significant forensics staff frequently also have other support resources.[25]

E. Ratings of Competitive Success

In addition to statements of forensics philosophy, data of staffing and credentials of staff, information about debate and the curriculum, and budget and other fiscal support figures, a debate program can also be described and analyzed, perhaps evaluated, by its competitive success. However, the authors have included this category last and least in our descriptive/evaluative/analytic framework as we believe it may be the least valuable criterion of all in evaluation and assessment because educational goals are so much more significant than competitive success figures. Also, many programs because of location, resources, number of participants, educational philosophy, size, etc. are not represented in competitive statistics because these numbers tend to primarily go to the biggest , richest, most competitive programs . Still, there are the ratings. CEDA and NDT conduct national tournaments each year to determine a national champion in each respective form of debate. They also keep point totals and give out debate sweepstakes awards in various categories. PKD holds a national tournament in alternate years. DSR-TKÅ and PRP host annual tournaments which include one or more debate championships. There are also results published in ISTR (Intercollegiate Speech Tournament Results). ISTR emphasizes sweepstakes results and is weighted towards combined debate and individual events programs, but debate results are published separately for 3rd, 2nd, and lst place in various divisions of debate at the vast majority of the nation's tournaments.

If an evaluator did not want to weigh a particular program absolutely utilizing these resources, he or she could at least pull out comparable programs in terms of size, resources, type of school, objectives of program, etc. and compare results. It would take some digging but the empirical results are there with regards to competitive success and these figures can and have been used by various programs as at least one evaluative measurement.

Framework #2: Outcomes Assessment Standards for a College or University Debate Program

A second framework for evaluating or assessing a debate program pays heed to the outcomes assessment pressures currently beginning to impinge on colleges and universities throughout the land. E. Sam Cox pointed to some of this in his article "Assessing and Re-Positioning the Educational Function of Collegiate Debate" [26] More recently, Bill Hill extensively discussed this rationale as the basis for a reexamination of "The Value of Competitive Debate as a Vehicle for Promoting Development of Critical Thinking Ability."[27] A whole series of arguments, pertinent to outcomes assessment in communication in general rather than in debate specifically, also covers this topic in the ACA Bulletin, April, 1990.

In these articles Gary Hunt states that "the assessment movement can be loosely defined as a series of internal and external pressures on higher education to quantify the impact that their programs have on student learning." [28]Robert M. Smith and Gary T. Hunt state:

Assessment is an appraisal of the value of the student's

> educational experience. As a result, assessment is student-centered, learning-measured, and accomplishment-focused. Assessment reverses the usual evaluation model. Instead of the student's test results being a reflection of the student's ability, the results are used to reflect on the program's ability to educate. Results are to provide: (1) information on what has been learned and how well; (2) an index between desired learning and actual accomplishments; and (3) a vehicle for communicating the results to faculty, students, and other constituents.[29]

Outcomes assessment is traditionally associated with some quantitative tests results, esp. single measure test results as in reading comprehension or math scores or in various ACT test measurements. However, outcomes assessment is becoming more sophisticated and complex and doesn't have to be a single quantitative test result. Assessment evaluators are working with any methods they can to identify program goals then to measure in whatever ways possible outcomes assessment as to skills, knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors graduates gain by participating in various educational programs. These methods are really just starting to be applied to debate programs, and only one empirical measure is in half way decent shape at this time, that evaluating critical thinking, but more about that later. At least outcomes assessment measures are starting to be applied to debate programs and the potential for application is quite obvious.

A. Portfolio Methods

One method being used in outcomes assessment is portfolios. This method could easily be used to measure the educational success of debate programs. The student could put early research efforts, cases, negative blocks, and even audio and video recordings of

her/his debating in a portfolio then update this material over a period of years as she/he debates. The portfolio could also contain student and faculty evaluations of these efforts showing growth as the student progresses. The portfolio could also contain ballots retained over a period of time or any of a variety of other materials, anything that could be kept to show a chronological growth and development of various debate skills, abilities, and aptitudes.

B. Surveys of Seniors, Alumni, and Career Information

Outcomes assessment evaluators also look to survey questionnaire results from seniors and/or alumni and to career utilization of program educational goals. Seniors or alumni are given survey questionnaires asking them about their satisfaction with a program such as debate. In some instances the seniors or alumni are given various scales concerning various skills, attitudes, behaviors, etc. and asked to rate their accomplishments. Such information is also occasionally gathered by exit interviews or alumni interviews. Frequently assessors want to know what skills or abilities the students learned that are pertinent in their current careers. All this may seem somewhat subjective and subject to the flaw that students may have gained their skills or abilities not from any single program, such as debate, but from their overall education. These methods are also subject to the validity flaw that the students in debate are already self-selected and may do better or worse on some measures of some skills, abilities, and/or attitudes because of who they are and not because of what a particular college program, such as debate, has done for them. Various protections are utilized to try to diminish these flaws in reliability and validity. The goal is to test the "value

added" on a particular collegiate educational program or activity such as debate.

C. Tests of Particular Skills and Abilities

Most familiar to evaluators and assessors using outcomes assessment mechanisms are tests and measures taken for particular skills, knowledges, abilities, or attitudes. Debate claims to teach many things. Austin J. Freeley claims that debate:

> 1. Debate provides preparation for effective participation in a free society.
> 2. Debate offers preparation for leadership.
> 3. Debate offers training in argumentation.
> 4. Debate provides for investigation and intensive analysis of significant contemporary problems.
> 5. Debate develops proficiency in critical thinking.\
> 6. Debate is an integrator of knowledge.
> 7. Debate develops proficiency in purposeful inquiry.
> 8. Debate emphasizes quality instruction.
> 9. Debate encourages student scholarship.
> 10.Debate develops the ability to make prompt, analytical responses.
> 11. Debate develops critical listening.
> 12. Debate develops proficiency in writing.
> 13. Debate encourages mature judgment.
> 14. Debate develops courage.
> 15. Debate encourages effective speech composition and delivery.
> 16. Debate develops social maturity.
> 17. Debate develops essential proficiencies[30]

Others have come up with alternative lists but this is a pretty good standard list. The key for outcomes assessment is to define carefully what skills, abilities, knowledges, aptitudes, and/or attitudes a program fosters so that these can then be tested and measured. The key is the social science key of having careful enough

specific enough definitions to be able to "operationally" define the category so it can be quantified.

The favorite debate skill or ability for testing has always been critical thinking and it still is today. Kent Colbert supports debate programs largely on this basis in two articles. [31] Bill Hill would like to support debate programs and have them evaluated on the same basis except that he is worried that current results are ambiguous and the favorite critical thinking test, Watson-Glaser, may not be a very precise method to measure what debate people really mean by critical thinking.[32] Nonetheless, this is the key exemplar debate now has of a clearly quantitative method to assess student outcomes.

Critical thinking has received almost all of the ink as to an ability fostered by debate. It is the prototype for all possible quantitative support for student achievement of academic goals in debate programs. Other variables, however, could also be tested. Brown-Carlsen has a critical listening test. And while "no standardized test is known to exist for communication, in part because the professionals within the discipline cannot agree on what are the expected communication competencies" [33], various testing services have developed communication competency tests of various kinds, usually paper and pencil tests, such as the ACT test and administrators know the demand for such tests is palpably current. It may be more difficult to test other skills such as the ability to synthesize complex materials, the ability to refute quickly and effectively, etc., but that which debate claims to teach is going to be pushed for quantification. As K. Wayne Wall said in The Forensic January, 1970 and has been repeated in article after article on debate

and research "We Need to Prove What We Believe."[34] We are going to have to take our goals, such as enhancing critical thinking, and make sure we can make those goals testable. If current tests are inappropriate, others will have to be invented. We need more articles like Bill Hill's, taking a debate goal or outcomes assessment objective and carefully examining what has and can be done.

Conclusion

The authors specified in the introduction to this paper that there was no single best way to evaluate a given debate program since each program is unique and must be evaluated within the context of its school, its program objectives, by the type/s of debate in which it participates, etc. However, debate programs can currently tailor for themselves or have tailored for them some kind of assessment. Currently debate programs can be evaluated or assessed utilizing various aspects of a descriptive/evaluative/analytic framework. Within this model, statements of the educational philosophy of the program would be checked, staffing and staff credentials would be noted, the curricular and cocurricular place of the program would be examined, the budget would be checked and compared to the budgets of similarly situated programs or aspirational programs, and ratings of competitive success might be noted. The information for such evaluations or assessments is available in the literature on directing forensics, in the statements of national conferences on debate, and in the baseline data of a number of surveys of debate programs currently existent in forensics literature.

Soon debate programs, along with much else in higher education, will also have to start utilizing student outcomes assessment data. For this to happen, forensics educators are going to have to operationalize the goals or educational objectives of debate and find or create empirical tests to measure how well they teach students. Portfolio methods are already readily available for debaters. Some debate programs have long utilized exit or alumni surveys or information about skill utilization in careers. However, the main aspirational goal of outcomes assessment is to have quantitative data through testing showing clearly skill, knowledge, attitude, or behavioral change. So far debate only has one real exemplar of this type, critical thinking testing, and that may be flawed. Nonethless, the variables for testing such as critical listening, communication competence, research knowledgeability and capacity, etc. are all there ready for testing if debate educators can find or create the appropriate tests. We have long known that we must be able to prove what we claim. That is the essence of debate education and it is now coming home to roost in outcomes assessment for debate. It shouldn't really be a worry for us but a challenge we should happily accept.

FINIS[35]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[1]There are a number of directing forensics textbooks. The authors would point to three. Donald W. Klopf and Carroll P. Lahman, Coaching and Directing Forensics, Skokie, IL.: National Textbook Co., 1967. Don F. Faules, Richard D. Rieke, and Jack Rhodes, Directing Forensics: Contest and Debate Speaking, Denver, CO.: Morton Publishing Co., 1976, 2nd ed., and Michael D. Bartanen, Teaching and Directing Forensics, Scottsdale, AZ.: Gorsuch Scarisbrick, Publishers, 1994.

[2]James H. McBath, editor, Forensics as Communication: The Argumentative Perspective, Skokie, IL.: National Textbook Co., 1975, Donn Parson, editor, American Forensics in Perspective, Annandale, VA.: Speech Communication Association, 1984., Sally Roden, editor, Proceedings of the 1991 Professional Development Conference, University of Central Arkansas: PKD, 1981., and David A. Thomas and Stephen C. Wood, editors, CEDA: 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings, Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, 1993.

[3]Steve Hunt and Edward Inch, "The Top Fifty Forensics Programs in the U.S.: A Twenty Year Retrospective", Unpublished Paper, 1993 and three previous studies on the same subject by Steve Hunt 1978 , 1983, and 1987. Ronald Prochaska, "Forensics Education at Public Junior and Community Colleges: A National Study," JAFA (Fall, 1981) 120-129, Pamela L. Stepp and Ralph B. Thompson, "A Survey of Forensics Activity at Selected Colleges and Universities in the United States , 1987" The National Forensic Journal (Fall, 1988) 121-136. Jack E. Rogers "What Do They Have That I Haven't Got?: Comparison Survey Data of the Resources and Support Systems of Top CEDA Programs and Directors", CEDA Yearbook, 1991, Pp. 95-105. Tom Murphy, CEDA Yearbook 1992.

[4]James H. McBath, ed., Forensics as Communication: The Argumentative Perspective, p. ll.

[5]Ibid., p. 24.

[6]Directing Forensics: Contest and Debate Speaking, Pp. 33-67.

[7]Ibid., P. 66.

[8]Donn Parson, ed., American Forensics in Perspective, p. 10.

[9]David A Thomas and Stephen Ç. Wood, editors, CEDA: 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings", Pp. 169-182.

[10] Sally Roden, ed., Proceedings to the 1991 Professional Development Conference, Pp. 139-159.

[11]Ibid., Pp. 129-137.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[12]James McBath, ed., Forensics as Communication, p. 43.

[13]Ibid, p. 44.

[14]Vigorous discussion on just these points was sustained at the 20th Anniversary CEDA Assessment Conference.

[15]Hunt and Inch, "The Top Fifty Forensics Programs in the U.S.: A Twenty Year Retrospective", Pp. 9-12. Jack E. Rogers "What Do They Have That I Haven't Got? Comparison Survey Data of the Resources and Support Systems of Top CEDA Programs and Directors", P. 99.

[16]See all the surveys in footnote #3 vis a vis release time figures.

[17]Hunt and Inch, "The Top Fifty Forensics Programs in the U.S.: A Twenty Year Retrospective",

[18]Fran Hassenchal, "The Status of Graduate Courses Designed for Directors of Forensic Programs" The Forensic, (Fall, 1993) in press.

[19]Hunt and Inch, "The Top Fifty Forensics Programs in the U.S.: A Twenty Year Retrospective", p. 21.

[20]Jack Rogers, "What Do They Have That I Haven't Got?", p. 99.

[21]Ibid.

[22]Ibid.

[23]Hunt and Inch, Pp. 18-19.

[24]"A Survey of Forensics Activity at Selected Colleges and Universities in the United States in 1987".

[25] Tom Murphy CEDA Yearbook 1992.

[26]in Sally Roden, ed. , Proceedings to the 1991 Pi Kappa Delta Development Conference, Pp. 139-159.

[27]CEDA Yearbook , 1993, Pp. 1-22.

[28]"The Assessment Movement: A Challenge and an Opportunity.", ACA Bulletin (April, 1990), p. 5.

[29] "Defining the Discipline: Outcome Assessment and the Prospects for Communication Programs", ACA Bulletin (April, 1990) p. 1.

[30]Austin J. Freeley, Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making, 6th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1986 Pp. 19-27.

[31]"Why Should We Support Debate?" Journal of the American Forensic Association, (Spring, 1985) 237-240. and "The Effects of CEDA and NDT Debate Training on Critical Thinking Ability" Journal of the American Forensics Association (Spring, 1987) 194-201.

[32]Bill Hill, "The Value of Competitive Debate as a Vehicle for Promoting Development of Critical Thinking Ability" esp. Pp. 10-11.

[33]Robert Smith, "Issues, Problems, and Opportunities in Assessment of Communication Programs" ACA Bulletin (April, 1990), p. 22.

[34]K. Wayne Wall, "A Research Proposal for Pi Kappa Delta: We Need to Prove What We Believe" The Forensic (January, 1970) Pp. 3-4. See also the various articles in the special issue on forensics scholarship of The National Forensic Journal (Spring, 1990) and Edward J. Harris, Jr., Richard P Kropp, Jr. and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Robert E. Rosenthal "The Tournament as Laboratory: Implications for Forensic Research" National Forensic Journal (Spring, 1986) 13-22.